UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/772,759	01/30/2001	Ashok Kumar	00-5016	9443

32127   7590   11/07/2003

VERIZON CORPORATE SERVICES GROUP INC.
C/O CHRISTIAN R. ANDERSON
600 HIDDEN RIDGE DRIVE
MAILCODE HQEO3HO1
IRVING, TX 75038

EXAMINER
JOSEPH, THOMAS J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 11/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/772,759	KUMAR ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas J Joseph	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 January 2001</u> .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-46</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-46</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1.   Claims 1 and 38 objected to because of the following informalities:

"...representations to effect a mapping between the frame ..." line 12 should read,

"...representations that affect a mapping between the frame ...". Appropriate correction

is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

3.   Claims 10 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention

is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The "Computer code for a host computer on

a network" as cited in claim 10 fails to make reference to a statutory computer readable

medium.

Inventions may be patented only if the claims fall within one of the four statutory

classes of subject matter under 35 USC 101: "process, machine, manufacture, or

composition of matter." *Keanee Oil Co. vs. Bicron Corp., 416 U.S. 470, 483, 181 USPQ*

673, 679 (1074). The applicant makes reference to "Computer code for a host

computer on a network". Claims directed to non-implemented computer programs do

not fall under any of the four statutory classes.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5.   Claims 1 – 8 and 38 – 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Barker et al. (US 6,363,421).

Claims 1 and 38:

Barker teaches a method and apparatus for presenting to a user a visual

representation of a frame resident at a central office of a telecommunications system

(fig. 10). Barker teaches accessing a database including data for accessing the current

condition (fig. 10). Barker teaches a method for displaying, based on the accessed

data, a graphical representation of the frame, the graphical representation that includes

visual indication of the current condition of the frame (fig. 10). Barker teaches

displaying based on the accessed data for graphical representations that affect a

mapping between the frame and telecommunications lines leading to and from the

frame (fig. 10).

Claims 2 and 39:

Barker teaches a displaying step for displaying the graphical representation of

the frame in response to the user specifying a particular frame from a particular central

office in the telecommunications systems (fig. 10).

Claims 3 and 40:

Barker teaches a frame being made up of constituent blocks and the displaying

step being display for a particular block from a specified frame in response to the user's

entry of coordinates for the block (fig. 10).

Claim 4 and 41:

Barker teaches allowing the user to modify attributes of the selected frame (fig.

10).

Claims 5 and 42:

Barker teaches a graphical representation of the frame being displayed at the

displaying step including a first web page showing a frame of a selected central office

laid out as a matrix of constituent blocks (fig. 10).

Claims 6 and 43:

Barker teaches a graphical representation of the frame being displayed at the

displaying step including a second web page showing available pins on any block within

the matrix (fig. 10 – 11). Barker further teaches allowing the user to search for a block

having a number of available pins entered by the user (fig. 10 – 11).

Claims 7 and 44:

Barker teaches allowing the user to assign a jumper from a port on a switching

card to an available pin and/or assign a jumper from an available pin to an outside plant

feeder (fig. 10).

Claims 8 and 45:

Barker teaches allowing the user to add a new frame at a selected central office

of the telecommunication system (fig. 10).

6.   Claims 32, 36, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated

by Hobbs et al. (US 6,523,022).

Claim 35:

Hobbs teaches code for communicating with a server on the network (fig. 1,

#183). The network also requires a server along with appropriate code on a computer

readable medium. Hobbs teaches a server having access to a database of information

relating to the condition of frames located at the telecommunications central offices (fig.

1, #164). Hobbs teaches code for sending requests to the server for information

relating to one or more frames (col. 12, lines 15 – 27). Hobbs teaches the requests

causing the server to initiated execution of database interface code, the database

interface code retrieving the requested data from the database and formatting a

graphical representation of a current condition of one or more frames in the request (col.

12, lines 15 – 27). Hobbs teaches code for receiving the formatted graphical

representation of the one or more frames from the server, the received graphical

representation allowing a user of the client computer interface with the graphical

representation to effect a mapping between the frames and telecommunications lines

leading to and from the frame (col. 12, lines 15 – 27).

Claims 36:

Hobbs teaches allowing the user to add a new frame at a selected central office

of the telecommunications system (col. 12, lines 15 – 27).

Claims 37:

Hobbs teaches specifying a number of modules, shelves, and blocks per shelf for

an added new frame (col. 12, lines 15 – 27).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 9 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Barker et al. (US 6,363,421) as applied to claim 8 and 45 above, and further in view of

Miller (US 5,553,083).

Claims 9 and 46:

Barker fail to teach specifying a number of modules, shelves, and blocks per

shelf for an added new frame. Miller (US 5,553,083) teaches the user specifying a

number of modules, shelves, and blocks per shelf for an added new frame (col. 6, lines

50 – 67). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to combine numbering of modules, shelves and blocks taught by Hobbs

with the networking disclosed by Barker. Doing so allows an administrator track

properties associated with the said new frame.

9.   Claims 10 – 19 and 21 – 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Barker et al. (US 6,363,421) further in view of Hobbs (US 6,523,022).

Claims 10 and 21:

Barker teaches computer code for a host computer on a network (fig. 9). The

host computer requires software that is driven by computer code. Barker teaches a

host computer being operable for communicating with a client computer on the network

and having access to a database of information relating to the condition of frames

located at the telecommunications system offices (fig. 9 – 10). Barker teaches a code

for processing requests from the client computer for information relating to one or more

frames (fig. 9).

Barker fails to teach code for initiating database interface code, the database

interface code retrieving the requested data from the database and formatting a

graphical representation of a current condition of the one or more frames in the request.

Hobbs (US 6,523,022) teaches code for initiating database interface code, the database

interface code retrieving the requested data from the database, and formatting a

graphical representation of a current condition of the one or more frames in the request

(col. 12, lines 15 – 27). Hobbs teaches a code for communicating the formatted

graphical representation of one or more frames to the client computer and for allowing a

user of the client computer to interface with the graphical representation to affect a

mapping between the frame and telecommunication lines leading to and from the frame

(col. 12, lines 15 – 27). HTML uses telecommunication lines for communicating data

associated with the frame. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention to combine code for initiating database interface code,

the database interface code retrieving the requested data from the database, and

formatting a graphical representation of a current condition of the one or more frames in

the request taught by Hobbs with the networking disclosed by Barker. Doing so

provides a human understandable method for accessing various items stored within the

database.

Claims 11 and 22:

Hobbs teaches code comprising the database interface code (col. 12, lines 15 –

27). Hobbs teaches the database code comprising a common gateway interface (CGI)

applications (col. 12, lines 15 – 27).

Claims 12 and 23:

Barker teaches interface code comprising a JAVA servlet (fig. 3, #44). Hobbs

teaches code comprising the database interface code (col. 12, lines 15 – 27).

Claims 13 and 24:

Hobbs teaches graphical representation of the frame being generated in

response to the user specifying a particular frame from a particular central office in the

telecommunications system (col. 12, lines 15 – 27).

Claims 14 and 25:

Hobbs teaches a frame being made up of constituent blocks and the graphical representations of the frame being shown a particular block from a specified frame in the response to the user's entry of coordinates for the block (col. 12, lines 15 – 27).

Claims 15 and 26:

Hobbs teaches allowing the user to modify attributes of the selected frame (col. 12, lines 15 – 27).

Claims 16 and 27:

Hobbs teaches a graphical representation of the frame being displayed at the displaying step including a first web page showing a frame of a selected central office laid out as a matrix of constituent blocks (col. 12, lines 15 – 27).

Claims 17 and 28:

Barker teaches a graphical representation of the frame including a second web page showing available pins on any block in the matrix, and allowing the user to search for a block having a number of available pins entered by the user (fig. 10).

Claims 18 and 29:

Barker teaches allowing the user to assign a jumper from a port on a switching card to an available pin/or assign jumper from an available pin on an outside plant feeder (fig. 10).

Claims 19 and 30:

Hobbs teaches allowing the user to add a new frame at a selected central office of the telecommunication system (col. 12, lines 15 – 27).

10.   Claims 20 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barker et al. (US 6,363,421) and Hobbs (US 6,523,022) as applied to claims 19 and 30 above, and further in view of Miller (US 5,553,083) .

Claims 20 and 31:

Barker and Hobbs fail to teach specifying a number of modules, shelves, and blocks per shelf for an added new frame. Miller (US 5,553,083) teaches the user specifying a number of modules, shelves, and blocks per shelf for an added new frame (col. 6, lines 50 – 67). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine numbering of modules, shelves and blocks taught by Miller with the networking disclosed by Barker and Hobbs. Doing so allows an administrator to track properties associated with the said new frame.

11.   Claims 33 – 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barker et al. (US 6,363,421) as applied to claim 32 above, and further in view of Hobbs (US 6,523,022).

Claims 33:

Hobbs fails to teach a graphical representation that includes a first web page showing a frame of a selected central office lay out as a matrix of constituent blocks. Barker teaches a graphical representation including a first web page showing a frame of a selected central office lay out as a matrix of constituent blocks (fig. 10). It would have

been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine

a graphical representation including a first web page showing a frame of a selected

central office laid out as a matrix of constituent blocks along with the graphical

representation including a first web page showing a frame of a selected central office

laid out as a matrix of constituent blocks taught by Barker with the processing of

databases and frames taught by Hobbs. Doing so allows an administrator or other user

to view network information using an organized format.

Claims 34:

Hobbs teaches graphical representation of the frame including a second web

page showing available pins on any block in the matrix (col. 12, lines 15 – 27). Barker

Teaches allowing the user to search for a block having a number of available pins

entered by the user (fig. 10).

Claims 35:

Barker teaches allowing the user to assign a bumper to a port on a switching

card to an available pin and/or assign a jumper from an available pin to an outside plant

feeder (fig. 10).

Conclusion

12.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Thomas J Joseph whose telephone number is 703-305-

3917. The examiner can normally be reached Mondays through Fridays from 7:30 am

to 4:00 pm.

    If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

    Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-

3900.

STEVEN SAX
PRIMARY EXAMINER

October 29, 2003
tjj